



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,282

11/20/2003

Koji Tanonaka

FUJI 20.756

3194

79326

7590

01/07/2009

Fujitsu Patent Center
C/O Intellevate LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 52050

EXAMINER

NAJEE-ULLAH, TARIQ S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2456

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/07/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/719,282	Applicant(s) TANONAKA, KOJI	
	Examiner TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH	Art Unit 2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed September 29, 2008. Claims 1-9 are pending in the case. No claims have been canceled or added. Claims 1-5 and 7-8 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Maeda et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,455, hereafter Maeda) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Priority

3. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2456

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,618,455 to Maeda et al (Maeda hereinafter) in view of US Patent No. 6,816,818 to Wolf et al (Wolf hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Maeda teaches **a synchronous network establishing method of establishing a synchronous network in which a node apparatus** (Wolf, col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 4) **conforming to a first synchronization scheme and a node apparatus conforming to a second synchronization scheme co-reside** (Maeda, col. 1, line 60 – col. 2, line 16). Maeda does not teach explicitly teach **wherein the first synchronization scheme and the second synchronization scheme implement different synchronous state indication codes for establishing the synchronous network, said method comprising converting a first synchronous state indication code used by the first synchronization scheme into a second synchronous state indication code used by the second synchronization scheme when the node apparatus conforming to the second synchronization scheme receives the first synchronous state indication code from the node apparatus conforming to the first synchronization scheme.**

Wolf teaches **wherein the first synchronization scheme and the second synchronization scheme implement different synchronous state indication codes for establishing the synchronous network** (Wolf, col. 2, lines 30-44), **said method comprising converting a first synchronous state indication code** (Wolf, col. 5, lines 1-12) **used by the first synchronization scheme into a second synchronous state**

Art Unit: 2456

indication code (Wolf, col. 2, lines 31-40) **used by the second synchronization scheme when the node apparatus** (Wolf, Col. 6, lines 53-67) **conforming to the second synchronization scheme receives the first synchronous state indication code from the node apparatus conforming to the first synchronization scheme**

(Wolf, Col. 6, lines 53-67). Maeda and Wolf are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of network communication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Wolf's synchronization method using synchronization status messages and codes with Maeda's clock synchronization method. The suggestion/motivation would have been (Wolf, col. 2, lines 31-40; col. 6, lines 53-67).

Regarding claim 2, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1 above including, **further comprising including the first synchronous state indication code that is supplied from the node apparatus conforming to one of the first scheme and the second scheme in an empty bit** (Maeda, fig. 2, col. 5, line 37-56) **of the converted second synchronous state indication code** (Wolf, Col. 6, lines 53-67).

Regarding claim 3, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1 above including, **further comprising using a pre-converted synchronous state indication code included in an empty bit** (Maeda, fig. 2, col. 5, line 37-56) **of the first synchronous state indication code that is supplied from the node apparatus conforming to one of the first scheme and the second scheme** (Wolf, Col. 6, lines 53-67).

Art Unit: 2456

Regarding claim 5, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 4 above including, **further comprising: a selecting unit to select one of the synchronous state indication code supplied from the counterpart node apparatus** (Maeda, fig. 16, col. 4, line 27-61) **and the converted synchronous state indication code obtained by the synchronous state indication code converting unit** (Wolf, Col. 6, lines 53-67).

Regarding claim 6, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above including, **wherein the selecting unit administers switching according to a switching instruction signal** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 35).

Regarding claim 7, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above including, **further comprising: a switch unit to instruct a switching of the selecting unit** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 35).

Regarding claim 8, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above including, **further comprising: a switching instruction unit to detect a bit of a signal supplied from the counterpart node apparatus to determine which of the first scheme and the second scheme said counterpart node apparatus conforms to, and to instruct a switching of the selecting unit based on the determination** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 61; Wolf, col. 4, lines 28-67).

Regarding claim 9, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as

Art Unit: 2456

described in claim 4 above including, **wherein a content to be converted by the synchronous state indication code converting unit can be arbitrarily changed** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 61; Wolf, col. 4, lines 28-67).

Conclusion

6. In conclusion, in an effort to better place the claims in condition for allowance, Examiner encourages further modification of claim language to include language that is more precisely descriptive and provides a more clear representation of what the Applicant presents as the invention in the specification in a manner which overcomes the prior art as presented. Examiner also reminds Applicant that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5,856,975 to Rostoker et al; US 5,864,554 to Rostoker et al; US 6,088,141 to Merli et al; US 2001/0043603 to Yu; US 6,877,043 to Mallory et al; US 6,882,634 to Bagchi et al; US 6,898,204 to Trachewsky et al; US 7,433,600 to Katagiri et al; US 2004/0042462 to O'Neill et al.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2456

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH whose telephone number is (571)270-5013. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2456

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T.N.

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456